DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 463 UD 028 217

AUTHOR Davidson, Mary E.; And Others
TITLE Monitoring Commission Report on the Status of Implementation of Desegregation Staff Development Components of the Student Desegregation Plan for the Chicago Public Schools. For the Subcommittee on Special Project Initiatives.
INSTITUTION Chicago Public Schools, IL. Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation.
PUB DATE Apr 85
NOTE 81p.; For a complete set of Commission Reports, see UD 028 213-233.
PUB TYPE Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Compensatory Education; Compliance (Legal); *Desegregation Plans; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inservice Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Peer Teaching; Program Evaluation; *School Desegregation; *Staff Development; *Staff Orientation; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS *Chicago Public Schools IL

ABSTRACT

This evaluation examines the implementation of the staff development components of a court-mandated school desegregation plan in Chicago (Illinois). Under the plan, the Board of Education was required to provide preservice and inservice training programs for administrators, teachers, and other school personnel, especially those involved in compensatory education programs in predominantly Black and Hispanic American schools remaining segregated. The following findings are presented: (1) responsibility for staff development is not centralized; (2) the staff development effort is fragmented; (3) delivery is hampered by the lack of an integrated process for the delivery of activities; (4) activities continue to focus on the presentation of information; (5) the peer training model has not proven efficient and effective for providing staff development for teachers; (6) the present procedures for assessing systemwide needs duplicate efforts by other agencies and bureaus and require a clearer focus on objectives to produce worthwhile data; (7) there has been no systematic evaluation of the effects of staff development efforts; (8) there does not appear to be adequate time for implementation of citywide activities; (9) the reporting formats hamper the use of secondary documentation in monitoring activities; and (10) staff development delivery appears to have increased. Recommendations for improvement are made. Three charts are included. A 16-item bibliography and a review of the status of the desegregation plan's components arranged by recommendation are appended. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Lubens - Oslejd
Monitoring Comm DS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED336463

Monitoring Commission Report on the Status of Implementation of

DESEGREGATION STAFF DEVELOPMENT COMPONENTS

Of the Student Desegregation Plan For the Chicago Public Schools

For the
Subcommittee on Special Project Initiatives

April, 1985

Mary Davidson,
Staff Consultant

Leon D. Finney, Jr.,
Commission Chairman

Manford Byrd, Jr.
General Superintendent of Schools
Chicago Public Schools

UD028217

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Leon D. Finney, Jr., Chairperson

Nancy M. Abbate
Elias Argott
James W. Compton
Edgar G. Epps
Wolfgang Epstein
Helene S. Gabelnick
Harry B. Gibson
Virginia F. Lewis
Lester H. McKeever, Jr.
Juan Soliz
Michael W. Scott
Monica Faith Stewart
Rodolfo E. Vilaro

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Helene S. Gabelnick, Chairperson, Subcommittee on Magnet Schools and Student Transfer Options

Lester H. McKeever, Jr., Chairperson, Subcommittee on Finance, Budget, and Affirmative Action

Michael W. Scott, Chairperson, Subcommittee on Effective Schools

Rodolfo E. Vilaro, Chairperson, Subcommittee on Special Project Initiatives

STAFF CONSULTANT TO COMMISSION

Mary Davidson

Monitoring Commission Report
on the
Status of Implementation of
Desegregation Staff Development Components
of the Student Desegregation Plan
for the Chicago Public Schools

The initial research and draft report were prepared by Dr. Peggy Williams. The research and original report were updated and revised based on the August, 1984 Annual Desegregation Review of the Educational Components by Dr. Geraldine Brownlee.

Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	MONITORING COMMISSION EVALUATION REPORT.....	12
III.	MONITORING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS.....	24
IV.	APPENDIX: Implementation Status of the Desegregation Staff Development Components of the Student Desegregation Plan, by Recommendation.....	27

I. INTRODUCTION

This study was undertaken in order to examine the progress of the Chicago Board of Education in implementing the staff development components of the Student Desegregation Plan for the Chicago Public Schools: Recommendations on Educational Components, adopted in 1981. This status report is based on data obtained through September, 1984.

The Consent Decree, entered in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois on September 24, 1980, made specific references to staff development in racially isolated and desegregated schools:

> Section 7. Compensatory Programs in Schools Remaining Segregated. To accomplish the objective stated in Section 2.2, the plan will include specific programs for Black or Hispanic schools remaining segregated, in the following areas among others: 7.3 Preservice and in-service instruction for administrators, principals, teachers and other school personnel.
>
> Section 11. Facilitating Success of the Desegregation Process. 11.2 School personnel. The plan will provide for pre-service and in-service training programs for Board personnel such as administrators, teachers, auxiliary staff, bus drivers and monitors.

The staff development components studied encompassed the general recommendations for staff development and/or pre-service and in-service training of Board of Education administrative personnel, faculty, and staff, as well as staff development in Curriculum and Instruction, magnet schools, Special Education, Bilingual Education, and student discipline. Implementation of the staff development components was reviewed within the context of the Consent Decree

and focused on those specific recommendations listed in the Student Desegregation Plan.

The recommendations on desegregation/staff development in the Student Desegregation Plan are summarized in the Appendix. The status of the implementation of each of those recommendations was determined through a review of secondary and primary data.

Primary data were drawn from interviews with a limited number of Board of Education personnel responsible for implementation of various desegregation/staff development recommendations. Selective review of original documents provided verification of the content of workshops and courses and the level of participation of Board personnel in desegregation/staff development activities.

Desegregation/staff development activities reported in secondary documents provided only a summarized version of the activities implemented. It is assumed, however, that these activities are representative of the overall effort to implement the Student Desegregation Plan and can be used as a basis for examining the status of implementation of that plan.

A status report on implementation of desegregation staff development recommendations derived from such sources has been summarized and charted in the segment which follows. Next, the Commission evaluation and recommendations on implementation of staff development components are reported in sequence. For a detailed discussion of each

recommendation of the Student Desegregation Plan, see the Appendix.

	Compliance			
	Full	Partial	On-going	None
Curriculum and Instruction, Elementary Schools				
Systemwide				
Establish a centrally initiated and coordinated program of elementary school staff development focused on:				
a. mastery Learning as an instructional strategy		X	X	
b. other institutional strategies		X	X	
c. building-focused instructional strategies. (5)			X	
Newly Desegregated Schools				
Provide a program of extensive staff development for teaching, counseling, and administrative staff in newly desegregated schools. This in-service training should focus on methods of improving instruction, human relations, and parental involvement, so that all schools in the district can be effective for all of the students they serve. (1)		X	X	
Staff Development				
Provide in-service training appropriate for the successful implementation of this aspect of the desegregation effort, such training to be coordinated with the activities described in the Staff Development section of this report. (1)			X	

(Continued)

DESEGREGATION/STAFF DEVELOPMENT IMPLEMENTATION

	Compliance			
	Full	Partial	On-going	None
Curriculum and Instruction, Elementary Schools				
Establish a Task Force to identify mechanisms and standards for improved faculty evaluation and accountability, with a report due to the Superintendent on or before December 1, 1981, and implementation of the new provisions as soon thereafter as is practicable. (2)	The status of implementation of this recommendation will be evaluated in a later report on Affirmative Action			
Curriculum and Instruction, High Schools				
Provide staff development for high school teachers in the principles of effective classroom instruction, to include such factors as teacher expectations, classroom management, human relations, sequential organization of learning and correlation with testing, and other principles. (6)			X	X
Provide special training in school management, with particular emphasis on discipline, security, and school climate, for high school principals, assistant principals, and counselors and other ancillary staff. (7)	X	X		
Provide in-service training in the teaching of reading for teachers at the high school level. (9)	X	X		

(Continued)

DESEGREGATION/STAFF DEVELOPMENT IMPLEMENTATION

	Compliance			
	Full	Partial	On-going	None
Magnet Schools				
Assessment and Evaluation				
Continue to address both the assessment and possible modification of current magnet schools, including their location and programs, and the feasibility of establishing new magnets, with respect to attitudinal effects among students, staff, and parents. (1-e)			X	
Staff Development				
Provide in-service training appropriate for the successful implementation of this aspect of the desegregation effort, such training to be coordinated with the activities described in the Staff Development section of this report. (1)		X	X	
Special Education and Testing				
Staff Development				
Establish a required program of staff development for all personnel, including administrators and principals, responsible for the education of handicapped students. Staff development should include the following topics:				

(Continued)

DESEGREGATION/STAFF DEVELOPMENT IMPLEMENTATION

		Compliance	
		Full	Partial On-going
	Special Education and Testing (continued)		
a.	principles of psychometric and edumetric testing	X	X
b.	principles of test construction (including issues of validity and cultural bias)	X	X
c.	principles of nondiscriminatory assessment	X	X
d.	courses that lead to behavioral competencies in and knowledge of the cultures of the children being served	X	X
e.	courses that lead to an understanding of the different learning and cognitive styles employed by children	X	X
f.	preparation of individual educational programs	X	X
g.	preparation for implementation of mainstreaming. (1)	X	X
	Additional Study and Review		
	Establish a committee of district staff and local and national specialists to conduct an in-depth review of the screening, testing, placement, and mainstreaming procedures and practices in the Chicago public schools, with particular focus on the development of staff capabilities in this area. (1)	X	X

(Continued)

DESEGREGATION/STAFF DEVELOPMENT IMPLEMENTATION

	Compliance			
	Full	Partial	On-going	None
Bilingual Education				
Staff Development				
Provide in-service training appropriate for the successful implementation of this aspect of the desegregation effort, such training to be coordinated with the activities described in the Staff Development section of this report. (1)		X	X	
Within-School Segregation				
Prevention Strategies				
Provide in-service training for counselors and others involved in the student selection/placement process so that students are scheduled in a non-discriminatory manner. (1)		X	X	
Student Discipline				
In-service for Administrators, Faculty, and Students				
Implement in-service education programs as soon as possible for those involved in the disciplinary process: administrators, faculty, and students.(1)	X		X	

(Continued)

DESEGREGATION/STAFF DEVELOPMENT IMPLEMENTATION

	Compliance			
	Full	Partial	On-going	None
Student Discipline				
Focus in-service programs on human relations and multi-ethnic and multi-cultural relations, and on methods and techniques for reducing discipline problems, reducing suspensions, and developing strategies to improve the learning climate in the classroom. (2)	X	X		
Distribute to all students, parents, and faculty at the beginning of the school year a copy of the new uniform code of student conduct, and schedule appropriate orientation sessions for all students and faculty to review and discuss the contents of the code. (3)		X	X	
Provide in-service training for counselors in the area of dropout prevention. (4)				X
Staff Development				
Undertake a staff development program in May, 1981 for various categories of school personnel.				
a. Conduct a staff orientation program for all district superintendents, building principals, and selected personnel from central administration to provide information on the desegregation plan.			X	

DESEGREGATION/STAFF DEVELOPMENT IMPLEMENTATION

	Compliance			
	Full	Partial	On-going	None
Staff Development				
b. Conduct a similar orientation program for all counselors and adjustment teachers.		X		
c. Provide information for all teachers by showing edited videotapes of the above sessions. (1)			X	
Plan and implement a staff development program for September of 1981.				
a. Conduct an in-service training program for principals in schools affected by pupil reassignment.			X	
b. Conduct in-service training for counselors, adjustment teachers, social workers, and ancillary staff.			X	
c. Conduct in-service training for all teachers in schools affected by pupil reassignment. (2)			X	
Require that all administrators with responsibility for implementing any aspect of the overall desegregation plan complete relevant pre-service training. (3)			X	
Incorporate, as part of the pre-service and on-going in-service training, staff development needs identified as necessary to other plan components, with particular attention to uniform discipline codes; "effective schools" intervention in target				

(Continued)

DESEGREGATION/STAFF DEVELOPMENT IMPLEMENTATION

	Compliance			
	Full	Partial	On-going	None
Staff Development				
schools; Public Law 94-142 requirements for special education; implementation of non-discriminatory counseling and guidance procedures. (4)			X	
Faculty Desegregation and Affirmative Action				
Affirmative Action				
Establish a comprehensive program for identification, training, and placement of minority candidates for administrative positions; priority in this effort will be directed toward members of minority groups significantly under-represented in administrative positions. (2)			The status of implementation of this recommendation will be evaluated in a later report on Curriculum and Instruction	

II. MONITORING COMMISSION EVALUATION REPORT

Rationale

The Monitoring Commission defines staff development as a systematic attempt to alter the professional practices, beliefs, and understandings of school personnel in order to accomplish the Recommendations on the Educational Components of the Student Desegregation Plan for the Chicago Public Schools. Staff development should involve all persons who make up the total school organization: administrators, supervisors, teachers, support personnel and any others who work toward the accomplishment of the plan.

About half of the Recommendations on Educational Components for Staff Development refer to staff development programs. Staff development programs are explicit plans designed to include goal statements; objectives; sequential, continuous, integrated learning activities; and systematic evaluation feedback.The Commission, in its monitoring function, distinguishes between such programs and other staff development activities.

Some of the research findings related to staff development are confounded by methodological and conceptual problems. Still, in the past decade, knowledge about effective school practices and how adults (e.g., school persons) learn has provided a more solid base to assess which approaches to staff development and staff development programs are more powerful than others in bringing about appraisals, understandings, and improvements in schools. Therefore the Commission, following the current

knowledge base, has been guided by the following basic assumptions while monitoring the implementation of staff development programs and other staff development activities.

1. The classroom teacher is the staff person who is the pivotal force in improving schools.
2. The school site is the most promising place for educational improvements and professional growth through staff/development programs.
3. Staff ownership is the key to staff development; it follows then that staff development planning, implementation, dissemination, and evaluation should involve all school staff persons.
4. Evidence of effective staff development/programs is the degree of change in school staff person behavior and/or increase in student learning. Therefore, staff developers must be explicit about expected outcomes -- before implementation -- and include evaluation feedback and internal monitoring plans to measure them in the designs for staff development programs.

5. In staff development/program design and implementation, a developmental rather than a deficit approach is preferable: it utilizes the principles of adult development and learning and of teacher career stages; it provides explicit directions for administrative and peer leadership selection and function.

6. Staff development/programs are more effective when they include personal (e.g., family, life crises, disposition, experience, avocation) as well as organizational (e.g., school regulations, administrator styles, public trust, unions, community expectations) influences; both can help or impede staff development.

7. Staff development should be an incremental process rather than a "scatter shot" attempt. Consequently, important considerations to promote acquisition of new skills and transfer of training should include: (a) relevance to the school site and to school staff persons; (b) coordination, continuity, and sequence of learning activities; (c) length and time for training and planned practice; and (d) systematic feedback.

Evaluation

Guided by the foregoing rationale and the evidence from primary and secondary sources, which is given in detail in the Appendix to this Report, the Commission submits the following evaluation of the implementation of the desegregation staff development components.

A. Responsibility for staff development within the system is not centralized.

Many departments, bureaus, and programs conduct general staff development activities in addition to those staff development activities mandated by special projects such as the desegregation of the Chicago Public Schools. In addition, various bureaus and departments initiate staff development activities in connection with their own programs and projects. Each bureau and department has its own goals, objectives, activities, feedback procedures, and timelines for implementing staff development activities. Staff in the Bureau of Staff Development, Planning, and Monitoring Services act as brokers for staff development activities: they assess needs, select topics, hire presenters, arrange for sites, prepare schedules and announcements, and collect feedback. Also, OEEO staff in the Bureau of Support Services offer major workshops and mini-workshops which focus on recommendations related to the various components of the Student Desegregation Plan.

B. The staff development effort is fragmented.

One consequence of the lack of centralized responsibility for staff development is fragmentation. Many bureaus, departments, and programs are planning and implementing in isolation their own staff development activities; there is no mechanism to enhance continuity and prevent duplication of effort.

C. Delivery of desegregation/staff development is hampered by the failure to establish an integrated process for delivery of staff development activities.

The departments and bureaus responsible for providing staff development for each category of school personnel (e.g., teachers, principals, counselors, etc.) are engaged in narrowly focused planning activities specifically related to the goals and objectives of the individual departments or bureaus. There are no opportunities for several categories of personnel to participate in meetings with each other because separate meetings are scheduled simultaneously.

D. Staff development activities continue to focus on presentation of information.

The Board has mandated the implementation of the mastery learning model, yet it is interesting to note that the applicability of this model to staff development is ignored. The taxonomy underlying the model suggests a hierarchy of mental

activity which proceeds from simple to more complex, or concrete to abstract, intellectual activities. This hierarchy, which begins at the knowledge level and flows to comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation, forms the basis for the activities planned.

The Department of Curriculum and Instruction has carefully attended to each of those levels in the development of instructional materials for CMLR and CMLM. However, less attention has been given to developing staff development activities which represent the developmental levels of intellectual processes. That is, workshop sessions are offered which provide an introduction to ideas, methods, attitudes, and innovative programs and processes, but there are only rare instances where mechanisms are in place to carry the introductory activity to succeeding intellectual levels.

However, some of the exceptions have been notable. In the Intensive Reading and the Intensive Mathematics Improvement Programs, there have been follow-up in-service activities which have addressed the higher intellectual levels, and the classroom applicability of such activities has been monitored. Also, the Bureau of Special Education Staff Development utilized mastery learning concepts in planning activities to prepare general education teachers for EMH students who are in transition to regular education.

E. The peer training model of staff development has not proven to be an efficient and effective means for providing staff development for teachers in the System.

Currently, a peer training model is used to deliver staff development to teachers and staff at the school level. This model provides for the training of principals and lead teachers who, in turn, deliver training activities to the school site.

There are major problems related to this model which prevent it from being efficient and effective.

First, there are no criteria or guidelines for selecting lead teachers. Selection is almost entirely a decision of the local principal, and albeit selection procedures vary greatly from school to school; too often lead-teacher selection is based on past performance and/or favoritism. A consequence is marked inconsistency in the skills and abilities of lead teachers selected to represent schools at staff development meetings.

Second, the lead teachers, once selected, are exposed to a wide range of topics which are limited mainly to knowledge-level activities. To date, no attempt has been made to provide them with a staff development program designed to improve their ability to lead in school-based staff development/programs.

Third, dissemination of what is learned at centrally initiated staff development activities is controlled by the local principal. But often the time and resources required to do it are not allocated, which results in non-implementation at individual school sites. There is no system in place to monitor school-site implementation of centrally initiated staff development activities.

Fourth, until very recently, when OEEO established a process for conducting local needs assessments, teachers had little input into staff development planning and delivery. In cases where the principal planned for delivery of peer training, it often seemed irrelevant to their needs by the time the information covered in city-wide or program-wide meetings reached the teachers at school sites.

In response to these problems, a proposal for the development of The Trainers Institute -- implemented during the 1983-84 school year -- was approved for funding through OEEO. The Institute has the potential to improve school-site desegregation staff development: its stated primary function is to provide training in staff development skills to other trainers who will serve as change agents in the delivery of activities related to desegregation issues. Accordingly, between June, 1984, and September, 1984, the Institute, in cooperation with OEEO, held two Chicago Effective Schools Planning Conferences for local school personnel from The Chicago Effective School Project. However, evaluation and monitoring plans for school outcomes were not set forth. (ADR, September, 1984).

F. Present procedures for assessment of system-wide needs utilized by many of the departments, bureaus, and programs in the System represent a duplication of effort in assembling similar information. Needs assessments require clearer focus on objectives to produce data of greater worth to program planners.

Another consequence of the lack of centralized responsibility for staff development is failure to standardize city-wide needs assessment processes. Each of the departments, bureaus, and programs in the system is conducting its own needs assessment, often assembling very similar information.

G. There has been no systematic evaluation of the effects of staff development efforts.

There are as many "evaluation" forms and formats as there are departments, bureaus, and programs conducting staff development. The use of the word "evaluation" is, in fact, a misnomer in most cases. For the most part, "evaluation" takes the form of feedback sheets which assess the participants' responses to the presentation and to the presenter. This is useful information for planning presentations, but it is not evaluation in the true sense. The "evaluative" data generated through such processes do not "evaluate" the effects of staff development efforts.

What is needed is a plan for sequential, continuous staff development learning and training activities with practice time that includes -- from the outset -- provisions to gather evidence, periodically and systemically, on expected school outcomes (i.e., changed teacher behavior and/or increased student learning). Implementing such a planned process permits evaluation of the staff development experiences and the impact of staff development programs on the school site.

H. There appears to be inadequate time available for the implementation of city-wide activities related to desegregation staff development.

According to the Director of the Bureau of Staff Development, the State of Illinois and Cook County allow the Chicago Public School System ten half-days of staff development time per year. Much of it is used for purposes other than staff development. The two city-wide "half-days" devoted to staff development actually amount to less than four hours of training time. The bulk of staff development activities are attended by lead teachers and principals who are responsible for delivering the information.

I. The formats for progress reports, annual reviews, and other similar documents hamper the process of monitoring from secondary documentation.

Reports and reviews which document activities implemented in relation to the Student Desegregation Plan are very voluminous. In addition, the content of the documents is not structured so that a specific recommendation is the organizing element for which evidence on implementation is presented. Furthermore, both content and approach, too often, show little evidence that there is a conception of how the educational components relate to one another or to the school, district, or central persons or units. Such reporting on implementation suggests that there is either an absence of planned internal monitoring or that internal monitoring is ineffective and inefficient. A major consequence

of such diffuse accounts is the costliness of culling out evidence to document and to monitor implementation.

J. There is evidence of an increase in desegregation/staff development delivery.

The documentation reveals an increase in planning and implementation of desegregation/staff development activities. Many apparent weaknesses in the process during the first year had disappeared by the end of the second year. The charted summary on pages 4 to 11 represent an update of all staff development activities. However, documents that were reviewed provide evidence that suggests there are basic systemic consequences for staff development and/or staff development program implementation when curriculum development activities and instruction activities are initiated from various uncoordinated units. This is not unique to desegregation staff development/program implementation.

Desegregation/staff development activities have been hampered by the failure to establish a unit within the System with responsibility for planning, conducting, coordinating, monitoring, and evaluating on-going and new efforts. Because desegregation/staff development activities are being carried out by various entities throughout the System, efforts are fragmented and impeded by barriers created by different and competing goals and interests. The efforts of some administrative units overlap and partly duplicate the efforts of others, thus reducing the cost-effectiveness of the total enterprise.

Whether one sees curriculum as ends (apart from what is being taught and learned) or as means (instructional content) is not argued here. Rather, what is clear in the reports is that the notion of dualism (separation of curriculum from instruction) has created pragmatic problems which thwart implementation. Put more specifically, to implement staff development and/or staff development programs from separate units of Curriculum and of Instruction, and from other programs and departments, means that a clear distinction has been made between subject matter and teaching/learning activities. This separation necessarily makes staff development programs more costly, for it creates educational discontinuity and isolation. But even more important, such severance maintains an unrealistic position because in the world of the school classroom, this duality of separation tends not to exist.

A central authority to plan, carry out, coordinate, and evaluate desegregation and other staff development activities could help to avoid some of these shortcomings.

III. MONITORING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

The Monitoring Commission on Desegregation Implementation offers the Chicago Board of Education the following recommendations to improve implementation of staff development components of the Student Desegregation Plan.

(1) The Trainers Institute should be institutionalized to provide a much needed mechanism for delivery of staff development associated with the future implementation of various programs and projects.

The primary function and the goals of the Trainers Institute seem consistent with the staff development needs. Application of the training of trainers concept and implementation of the proposed training programs can be a vehicle for improving the delivery of staff development/programs.

(2) A standardized needs assessment process should be developed to serve the common data needs of the various departments, bureaus, and programs.

Individual units could focus their assessments in depth on the activities unique to their operations. Needs assessment efforts require a clear focus on the objectives at issue in order to provide useful information. Staff development programs have limited resources and often must address only the primary needs

expressed. Greater focus on specific objectives would assemble a narrower range of more pertinent information.

(3) A self-monitoring plan that specifies agreed upon interpretations of recommendations for use in the process of assessment of desegregation/staff development implementation should be developed and implemented if planners and implementers set forth clearly stated goals, objectives, measures for assessment (formative and summative evaluation plans) and timelines for staff development/programs.

If this were done, as each of the aforementioned components is implemented, findings from the evaluation process would be available for self-monitoring and, when necessary, for Commission and/or external monitoring.

(4) A reporting format that lists activities and support data, by recommendation, should be adopted to facilitate the process of monitoring from secondary documentation.

Most of the information pertaining to assessing the degree of implementation of the desegregation/staff development recommendations was extracted from Board of Education reports prepared for other purposes. This is a very time-consuming process. Moreover, given the length and arrangement of content in the narrative of some reports, it is also possible to overlook pertinent

activities. To expedite the work of the Commission and to provide documentation for internal monitoring as well, reports should follow these guidelines. Write the recommendation on which implementation will be reported as the heading or topic. Describe, concisely, any activity or development undertaken to comply with the recommendation. Present quantitative and qualitative data or evidence in support of implementation of the recommendation. Report any other pertinent related information. Repeat the same procedure in reporting on other recommendations. Designate a person or persons to prepare one document on the staff and develop components from all reports submitted -- in the foregoing format -- by the units/persons responsible for reporting implementation of the recommendations.

(5) Special attention should be given to a recommendation for which initiatives to implement it have yet to be documented. Implementation status for in-service training for counselors in the area of dropout prevention has not been documented. Yet there is no explanation in written documents of what is preventing compliance, if indeed noncompliance exists. When the status of a recommendation is atypical -- as in this example -- it is a clear signal that the recommendation deserves special monitoring.

IV. APPENDIX

Implementation Status of
The Desegregation Staff Development Components
of the Student Desegregation Plan
by Recommendation

STUDENT DESEGREGATION PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Curriculum and Instruction, Elementary -- Systemwide

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

ESTABLISH A CENTRALLY
INITIATED AND COORDINATED PROGRAM OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
STAFF DEVELOPMENT FOCUSED ON
MASTERY LEARNING AS AN INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGY.

A major thrust of the Department of Curriculum, previous to September, 1983, has been writing, producing, disseminating, field testing, evaluating, and revising materials for Mastery Learning in Reading and in Mathematics. By 1983-84, Chicago Mastery Learning Reading Program (CMLRP), Vocabulary Learning Materials for grades one through six had been field tested and distributed. Albeit there is a discrepancy on the grades in which Chicago Mastery Learning Math Program (CMLMP) materials are in use and/or are being developed (refer to Annual Desegregation Review 1983-84 , pp. 140,159), the Department's document on implementation in 1983-84 indicated that in-service radio broadcasts for teachers on CMLMP instruction by Mathematics Bureau staff should be expanded. Moreover, their report noted that there is a need for staff development to train teachers in the use of MLM materials in instruction in the elementary school, but it did not include specific initiative and coordinated program plans for staff development in MLR and MLM instruction among their 1984-85 priorities.

The Department of Instruction reports one of its 1982-83 initiatives to be improvement of instruction in the CMLRP and CMLMP. To this end, the Bureau of Staff Development, Program Planning, and Monitoring Services offered the following in MLR and in MLM: (1) in-service for cadre substitute teachers and for new teachers; (2) Lane III promotional credit courses; (3) noncredit mini-courses; and (4) three sessions that were components of the city-wide half-day in-service program. The 1983-84 report on staff development indicates in-service was given to elementary school cadre teachers and new teachers on the topic of an Overview of CMLP in Reading and Mathematics.

For the most part, reports on initiatives and activities present unclear evidence on staff development programs on Mastery Learning (ML) as an instructional strategy in the elementary school. For example, there are no data on elementary school teacher enrollees in specific MLR and/or MLM courses and/or mini-courses in 1982-83 and 1983-84. Nor is there information on program goals, objectives and prerequisites; sequential course offerings; courses completed by enrollers; and schools where course enrollees are assigned. Furthermore, even though all offerings and activities were said to provide for evaluation feedback, to date neither evaluation nor monitoring of implementation has taken place "due to minimal staff within the Bureau" (ADR, 1983-84, p. 514). Moreover, inadequate staff is the reported reason for problems in Central Office articulation between units that provide training activities.

The Trainers Institute proposes to remedy some central coordination problems in that one of the Institute's primary functions is to provide training in staff development skills to other trainers who will serve as change agents in the delivery of activities related to desegregation issues at the Central, District, and Local school levels. With reference to ML, the 1983-84 stated Goals and Priorities and Major Accomplishments and Activities reported on the Institute do not indicate a focus to be ML, as an instructional strategy, nor do its 1984-85 stated Implementation Priorities. Staff development related evaluation and evaluation plans were not set forth in the ADR document (September, 1984), except for the Chicago Effective Schools Project, Level II, and Level III Racially Identifiable (elementary) Schools. City-wide test scores were reported as Chicago Effective Schools Project outcomes, and funded programs/proposals -- some of which may be interpreted to be related to ML -- have yet to be evaluated.

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

ESTABLISH A CENTRALLY INITIATED AND COORDINATED PROGRAM OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STAFF DEVELOPMENT FOCUSED ON OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES.

In 1982-83, the Department of Curriculum published multicultural, bias-free curriculum guides and, in 1983-84, revised guides in various subject areas (i.e., Science, Drug Education, Family Life Education). In turn, appropriate Bureau staff in the

Department conducted in-service and pre-service meetings and workshops for teachers and administrators to update instruction and also provide staff development through audio-visual aides. In addition, a variety of instructional approaches via new programs in mathematics, social studies, foreign languages, and the gifted have been introduced at the local school level. In two elementary schools, staff development has focused on the Socratic Instructional Method.

The Department of Instruction Services has offered a variety of Lane III promotional credit courses and noncredit mini-courses. Based on the reports on the 1982-83 and 1983-84 activities and initiatives of the Bureau of Staff Development, Planning, and Monitoring, the courses and mini-courses that relate to this recommendation have focused on teaching communication skills and mathematics and covered a variety of topics in those subject areas.

Through OEEO, in 1983-84 15 new staff positions were opened to assist local schools in planning and implementing programs. Nonetheless, some of the questions raised concerning initiatives and coordination of staff development/programs in other instructional strategies were the same as those which were identified in the preceding recommendation on implementation of a program of staff development on ML as an instructional strategy; namely: course enrollee/school data and course/program design. In the ADR (1984) Curriculum and Instruction report, other implementation problems were indicated: 1) insufficient Central Office staff to conduct staff development activities; 2) absence

of teacher involvement in curriculum revision decisions; 3) inability to monitor implementation; 4) inadequate resources for conducting evaluation; and 5) non-expansion of magnet-type programs. In their view, these problems should be solved through adequate funding.

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

ESTABLISH A CENTRALLY INITIATED AND COORDINATED PROGRAM OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STAFF DEVELOPMENT FOCUSED ON BUILDING-FOCUSED INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES.

Staff in Curriculum and Instruction and in Instruction Services have coordinated implementation of local, district, and city-wide workshops for resource persons and other representatives from districts and local schools. They have offered promotional credit courses and mini-courses for interested staff members. These activities have provided participants with knowledge-level skills in the selection and use of various instructional strategies. Through programs such as Intensive Reading Improvement and Intensive Mathematics Improvement (IRIP and IMIP), Curriculum and Instruction has sought to improve the ability of teachers to apply a wide range of instructional strategies to meet their local needs and the needs of individual students. In order to provide some consistency in the staff development activities presented locally, Curriculum and Instruction developed instructional materials for use in local staff development.

While IRIP and IMIP and the modular instructional materials provide the mechanism for implementing building-focused instructional strategies, there was no evidence in the documentation reviewed of a process for monitoring consistent implementation. In fact, the same problem areas concerning staff development and staff development program implementation, activities and initiatives which centered on ML as an instructional strategy and other instructional strategies apply to this recommendation. Refer to the two preceding recommendations for further discussion.

2. Curriculum and Instruction, Elementary -- Newly Desegregated Schools

---

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

PROVIDE A PROGRAM OF EXTENSIVE STAFF DEVELOPMENT FOR TEACHING, COUNSELING, AND ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF IN NEWLY DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS. THIS IN-SERVICE TRAINING SHOULD FOCUS ON METHODS OF IMPROVING INSTRUCTION, HUMAN RELATIONS, AND PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT, SO THAT ALL SCHOOLS IN THE DISTRICT CAN BE EFFECTIVE FOR ALL OF THE STUDENTS THEY SERVE.

The documents reviewed reported the implementation of numerous staff development activities aimed at faculty and staff from both the newly desegregated and the targeted racially isolated schools. Some of these activities focused on the newly desegregated schools (e.g., training at the Race/Desegregation Institute sponsored by Northeastern University, assignment of

human relations teams to schools experiencing problems with desegregation programs, workshops for magnet school teachers, and 87 visits by OEEO staff to magnet schools to discuss staff development and to promote sharing of ideas). Other activities, such as the major workshops offered by OEEO's Bureau of Support Services during 1982-83, involved both newly desegregated and targeted racially isolated schools and focused on topics that would be of interest to both of these populations.

The Consultants' Research Report provided a rationale for this recommendation:

> . . . There are significant disparities in rates of achievement between predominantly non-minority and minority schools in Chicago. The reassignment of minority students to predominantly non-minority schools will have the effect of placing these disparities within the school, and will result in resegregation of students within the schools . . . (p. 295)

Based on that rationale, the consultants recommended that:

> Teaching, counseling, and administrative staff in newly desegregated schools receive extensive staff development on methods of reducing disparities in achievement that may exist between minority and non-minority students. (p. 296)

The literature review suggested several elements of an effective staff development program for reducing disparities in achievement between minority and non-minority students, including: (1) multicultural sensitivity, (2) ethnic language patterns, (3) communication skills, (4) human relations training, (5) use of multicultural/bilingual curriculum materials, (6) individualized instruction, and (7) classroom management (Consultants' Research Report, p. 199).

Staff development activities have been implemented for teachers, counselors, and administrators of newly desegregated schools. However, when these activities are viewed in the context of the literature and the rationale for this recommendation, it is apparent that they do not reflect the full intent of the recommendation. If the aim of this staff development is to facilitate the reduction of disparities between non-minority and minority students, as was suggested in the Consultants' Research Report, there is clearly a need for staff development that addresses all of the elements described in the literature. The reduction of disparities between non-minority and minority students cannot be accomplished by a "shotgun approach" to staff development. It can only be accomplished by a systematic and highly focused program aimed at changing the attitudes and beliefs of educational personnel about minority students and improving their ability to meet the instructional needs of these students.

A "program of extensive staff development" would, at the very least, require a clear definition of goals and objectives (both introductory and follow-up) as well as formal mechanisms for collecting baseline data and for tracking changes in the behaviors of educational personnel in newly desegregated schools. If this kind of program exists, its existence was not highlighted in the documents reviewed by this investigator.

Funding of the Trainers Institute in 1983 by the OEEO may be an important development in the implementation of this recommendation in that the primary function of The Institute is to provide training in staff development skills to other trainers who will serve as change agents in the delivery of activities related to desegregation isues. Although The Institute's programmatic design was not given in the ADR (1984), in the 1983-84 school year, training of Central, District, and Local school trainers was begun; a training resource center and facility were started.

3. Curriculum and Instruction, Elementary -- Staff Development

---

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAINING APPROPRIATE FOR THE SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS ASPECT OF THE DESEGREGATION EFFORT, SUCH TRAINING TO BE COORDINATED WITH THE ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED IN THE STAFF DEVELOPMENT SECTION OF THIS REPORT.

This recommendation is covered under the general staff development recommendations.

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

ESTABLISH A TASK FORCE TO IDENTIFY MECHANISMS AND STANDARDS FOR IMPROVED FACULTY EVALUATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY, WITH A REPORT DUE TO THE SUPERINTENDENT ON OR BEFORE DECEMBER 1, 1981, AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW PROVISIONS AS SOON THEREAFTER AS IS PRACTICABLE.

Faculty evaluation and accountability and affirmative action were combined into one task force. This recommendation should be addressed as part of the report on the status of faculty desegregation and affirmative action recommendations.

4. Curriculum and Instruction, High School

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

PROVIDE STAFF DEVELOPMENT FOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS IN THE PRINCIPLES OF EFFECTIVE CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION, TO INCLUDE SUCH FACTORS AS TEACHER EXPECTATIONS, CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT, HUMAN RELATIONS, SEQUENTIAL ORGANIZATION OF LEARNING AND CORRELATION WITH TESTING, AND OTHER PRINCIPLES.

There were a number of courses on classroom management offered through the Bureau of Staff Development's Lane III promotional credit courses and mini-course program. Lane III promotional courses can be counted towards promotion to the Lane III salary track -- that is, masters degree plus thirty-six hours. The documentation did not indicate whether participants in these courses were high school teachers.

The Preliminary Annual Review on Aspects of Student Desegregation Implementation (August, 1982, p. 12) cited plans to implement training for high school teachers in effective classroom management. The implementation of these plans was not cited under major accomplishments, nor was implementation indicated in subsequent reports.

There was no evidence in the documentation of specific staff development activities for high school teachers focused on principles of classroom instruction related to teacher expectations, human relations, or sequential organization of learning and correlation with testing.

In 1982-83, through the Bureau of Staff Development, Program Planning, and Monitoring Services, 20 high school teachers had training in the teaching of reasoning skills and in 1983-84, 15 high school teachers had training in the teaching of writing skills. But, most important to this recommendation is the on-going staff development provided for 30 teacher specialists in reading and mathematics learning centers in the High School Renaissance Program. The reporting on this program gave session dates, attendance, and topics covered -- all of which were listed in this recommendation. Each session was evaluated and information was disseminated to all staff. Moreover, summative evaluation and institutionalization have been planned.

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

PROVIDE SPECIAL TRAINING IN SCHOOL MANAGEMENT, WITH PARTICULAR EMPHASIS ON DISCIPLINE, SECURITY, AND SCHOOL CLIMATE, FOR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS, ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS, COUNSELORS, AND OTHER ANCILLARY STAFF.

According to the documentation, the Department of Instruction Services and the Office of Field Management implemented a series of sessions designed to enhance the leadership and management skills of school principals. In addition, a number of training activities were implemented to familiarize school principals and counselors with the Uniform Discipline Code.

Several Lane III promotional credit courses and minicourses focusing on discipline were conducted during the years from 1981 to 1983.

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAINING IN THE TEACHING OF READING FOR TEACHERS AT THE HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL.

In-service training in the teaching of reading has been provided for teachers at the high school level. The training was provided through several special projects, including the High School Renaissance Program, Project Improving Reasoning Skills, and the Degrees of Reading Power Program.

The Degrees of Reading Power Program (High School Renaissance) has expanded from a pilot program in six high schools in 1982-83 to 49 high schools in June, 1984. The

staff development program is designed to improve classroom management and critical thinking skills as well as reading comprehension. During the second semester of the 1983-84 school year, staff development sessions were held, but the report of voluntary participation and the development of dissemination materials suggest the need to "tighten up" program implementation. Program evaluation results were not reported, although the College Board and the Department of Research and Evaluation are involved in testing outcomes.

It is implied in this recommendation that in-service training of this kind should be on-going, which suggests a need to plan a program of introductory and follow-up staff development activities in reading for high school teachers.

5. Magnet Schools -- Assessment and Evaluation

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

CONTINUE TO ADDRESS BOTH THE ASSESSMENT AND POSSIBLE MODIFICATION OF CURRENT MAGNET SCHOOLS, INCLUDING THEIR LOCATION AND PROGRAM, AND THE FEASIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING NEW MAGNETS, WITH RESPECT TO: ATTITUDINAL EFFECTS AMONG STUDENTS, STAFF, AND PARENTS.

It would appear that activities such as "Working Together for Excellence," which involved magnet school faculty and staff in networking, might provide informal mechanisms for assessing and modifying attitudinal effects among staff in magnet schools. However, there was no evidence in the

documentation reviewed that formal assessment and attitudinal modification activities which directly addressed this recommendation were in place.

6. Magnet Schools (Staff Development)

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAINING APPROPRIATE FOR THE SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS ASPECT OF THE DESEGREGATION EFFORT, SUCH TRAINING TO BE COORDINATED WITH THE ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED IN THE STAFF DEVELOPMENT SECTION OF THIS REPORT.

The documentation indicated that much of the staff development activity focused on magnet schools revolved around informal meetings and articulation among magnet school staff and between magnet school staff and OEEO staff. Several training sessions centered on topics pertinent to the successful operation of magnet schools. It was reported that staff from OEEO made 87 visits to magnet schools and programs to discuss staff development and to promote informal sharing of ideas. Magnet schools, along with other newly desegregated schools and targeted racially isolated schools, participated in a number of major workshops implemented by OEEO (Bureau of Support Services) during 1982 and 1983. The activities reviewed were confined to those reported in the secondary documents cited here and in the additional documentation provided by OEEO (Bureau of Support Services).

The Consultants' Research Report emphasized the need for staff development in magnet schools and suggested that teachers would benefit from additional skills training as well as programs to address attitudinal problems (p. 341). It would appear, from the documentation reviewed, that an attempt has been made through informal and formal mechanisms to address the concerns of magnet school staff. On-going staff development will be required to insure the effective implementation of the magnet school model, and the most recent report indicates that program descriptions and guidelines and directions for program implementation are incomplete; ergo, staff development has been delimited. (ADR, September, 1984). Adequate funding was said to be the solution to expedite implementation of magnet-type programs.

However, during the 1983-84 school year, an extensive staff development program for the Paideia Program was conducted by staff members of St. John's college, Sante Fe, New Mexico and is to be continued monthly by professors from the University of Chicago. The evaluation plans have been designed to be conducted by The Department of Research and Evaluation staff.

7. Special Education and Testing -- Staff Development

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

ESTABLISH A REQUIRED PROGRAM OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT FOR ALL PERSONNEL, INCLUDING ADMINISTRATORS AND PRINCIPALS, RESPONSIBLE FOR THE EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED STUDENTS. STAFF DEVELOPMENT SHOULD INCLUDE THE TOPICS OF PRINCIPLES OF PSYCHOMETRIC AND EDUMETRIC TESTING, PRINCIPLES OF TEST CONSTRUCTION, AND PRINCIPLES OF NONDISCRIMINATORY ASSESSMENT.

According to the reports reviewed and the documents presented by the Director of the Bureau of Special Education Staff Development, activities related to this recommendation were implemented for several kinds of populations. These include teachers in grades kindergarten to seven, all elementary and high school special education teachers, central office staff, and other administrators and support staff who have responsibility for handicapped students. Workshops on non-biased assessment were offered through the collaborative efforts of several departments and bureaus.

The rationale for the recommendation that "a required program of staff development" be implemented for personnel responsible for the education of handicapped students:

> The planning and development of a comprehensive in-service training program for special education staff must take cognizance of the fact that many of the actions and activities to be undertaken in the implementation of PL 94-142 may and probably will run counter to long-held traditions and practices.

The Department of Pupil Personnel Services has expended considerable effort to implement a staff development program for personnel responsible for the education of handicapped students. However, the use of the word "required" implies the need to certify completion of the established program. If such a process exists, it was not highlighted in the documents reviewed.

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

ESTABLISH A REQUIRED PROGRAM OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT FOR ALL PERSONNEL, INCLUDING ADMINISTRATORS AND PRINCIPALS, RESPONSIBLE FOR THE EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED STUDENTS. STAFF DEVELOPMENT SHOULD INCLUDE THE TOPIC OF COURSES THAT LEAD TO BEHAVIORAL COMPETENCIES IN AND KNOWLEDGE OF THE CULTURES OF THE CHILDREN BEING SERVED.

While it can be assumed that workshops which dealt with non-biased assessment covered information about the cultures of children, there was no mention in the documentation reviewed of workshops specifically focused on this subject. There were many sessions in OEEO's major workshops devoted to multicultural education. In addition, the Bureau of Staff Development, Program Planning, and Monitoring Services has offered courses related to multicultural education and plans to continue to do so. However, the documentation did not indicate the level of participation of particular personnel in these activities nor fulfillment of a "required program." As mentioned earlier, the word "required" in the

recommendation suggests the need to certify the participation of special education personnel in these activities.

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

ESTABLISH A REQUIRED PROGRAM OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT FOR ALL PERSONNEL, INCLUDING ADMINISTRATORS AND PRINCIPALS, RESPONSIBLE FOR THE EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED STUDENTS. STAFF DEVELOPMENT SHOULD INCLUDE THE TOPIC OF COURSES THAT LEAD TO AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE DIFFERENT LEARNING AND COGNITIVE STYLES EMPLOYED BY CHILDREN.

The documentation listed learning styles and modalities among the topics covered in training sessions for special education personnel. Staff in the Bureau of Special Education Staff Development have developed materials on learning styles and modalities and, according to the Bureau's Director, those topics have been incorporated into training activities for special education personnel.

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

ESTABLISH A REQUIRED PROGRAM OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT FOR ALL PERSONNEL, INCLUDING ADMINISTRATORS AND PRINCIPALS, RESPONSIBLE FOR THE EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED STUDENTS. STAFF DEVELOPMENT SHOULD INCLUDE THE TOPIC OF PREPARATION OF INDIVIDUAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS.

Several promotional credit courses and mini-courses on diagnostic/prescriptive procedures and development/implementation of individual educational programs (IEP's) were

offered from 1981 to 1983. The documentation cited plans to develop programs to address writing of quality prescriptive recommendations but did not provide evidence of implementation. Only limited evidence of implementation of staff development activities on the preparation of IEP's was presented in the summary reports reviewed, but requested additional documentation indicated that activities have been implemented in this area.

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

ESTABLISH A REQUIRED PROGRAM OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT FOR ALL PERSONNEL, INCLUDING ADMINISTRATORS AND PRINCIPALS, RESPONSIBLE FOR THE EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED STUDENTS. STAFF DEVELOPMENT SHOULD INCLUDE THE TOPIC OF PREPARATION FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF MAINSTREAMING.

The Bureau of Staff Development, Program Planning, and Monitoring Services offered a Lane III promotional credit course on mainstreaming during the 1982-83 and 1983-84 school years. Nine enrolled in the latter year. Half-day in-service training meetings focused on mainstreaming were conducted in September and November, 1983, for general and special education teachers, according to documentation produced by the Bureau. In addition, the Bureau of Special Education Staff Development produced "The Teacher's Guide to Mainstreaming: Student Characteristics and Strategies." This is a tool for use by general education teachers in planning instruction for mainstreamed students. The

Director of the Bureau indicated that this guide was distributed throughout the system along with other materials pertinent to mainstreaming.

During the 1983-84 school year, staff development activities to assist administrators, teachers, and parents with transitional students/children were offered by the Department of Pupil Personnel Services and Special Education and several of its Bureaus. Extensive communication efforts intended to inform and to instruct school personnel about the Transition Program were made. In addition, 41 elementary school teachers, 20 high school teachers -- representing the school districts -- and 20 staff members from the Bureau of Special Education attended an Institute for Transition in Action. An Illinois State Board Team and a Task Force of national experts have reviewed the Special Education Program, including mainstreaming. Final written reports, are forthcoming.

8. Special Education and Testing -- Additional Study and Review

---

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

ESTABLISH A COMMITTEE OF DISTRICT STAFF AND LOCAL AND NATIONAL SPECIALISTS TO CONDUCT AN IN-DEPTH REVIEW OF THE SCREENING TESTING, PLACEMENT, AND MAINSTREAMING PROCEDURES AND PRACTICES IN THE CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS, WITH PARTICULAR FOCUS ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF STAFF CAPABILITIES IN THIS AREA.

According to the documentation, The Task Force on Non-Discriminatory Assessment and Special Education was organized in June, 1980 and charged with implementation of this recommendation. There were no further citations in the documentation of the accomplishments of this Task Force. (See Monitoring Commission progress report on Special Education.)

In the 1983-84 school year, staff members of The National College of Education became consultants to the Bureau of Child Study to design and implement an extensive staff development program for Center psychologists and bureau staff on new assessment instruments and techniques; delivery of services through intervention strategies; and differential diagnosis and behavioral factors in children. One result of implementation activities in 1983-84 was an invitation from the General Superintendent to a panel of nine nationally known experts to serve on an EMH Reassessment Review Task Force to report and to make recommendations on the Bureau of Child Study Psychoeducational Assessment procedures, which could have some bearing on staff development in Special Education.

9. Bilingual Education (Staff Development)

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAINING APPROPRIATE FOR THE SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS ASPECT OF THE DESEGREGATION EFFORT, SUCH TRAINING TO BE COORDINATED WITH THE ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED IN THE STAFF DEVELOPMENT SECTION OF THIS REPORT.

The Department of Multilingual Education, in cooperation with the bureaus of Language Arts and Staff Development, and the Bilingual Demonstration and Materials Resource Center -- with support from OEEO -- has provided extensive in-service training in topics related to Bilingual Education. In addition to a city-wide half-day staff development activity on cross-cultural communication, classroom management, parental involvement, and native language instruction, promotional credit courses and mini-courses were offered; 300 learning packets were developed for inservicing bilingual teachers; appropriate handbooks were developed for distribution to bilingual education teachers; and numerous workshops were provided which focused on a number of topics relevant to bilingual education.

During the 1983-84 school year, a number of workshops and in-service sessions were conducted by the Department of Multilingual Education in cooperation with the District offices, and the Bureaus of Language Arts, Mathematics, Staff Development, Program Planning and Monitoring Services,

and Bilingual Demonstration and Materials Resources Centers. The topics covered in these activities were in keeping with the educational components and with the recommendations of a national panel, which in 1983 had studied the System's bilingual education program.

New teachers and other school personnel participated, but participation, by school site and school role, was not reported; consequently, it is difficult to determine whether the Department of Multilingual Education has complied with the full intent of the recommendation. A monitoring and evaluation plan is in place, but evaluation results from staff development efforts were not reported.

10. Within-School Segregation Prevention Strategies

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAINING FOR COUNSELORS AND OTHERS INVOLVED IN THE STUDENT SELECTION/PLACEMENT PROCESS SO THAT STUDENTS ARE SCHEDULED IN A NON-DISCRIMINATORY MANNER.

There is apparently a mechanism in place for monitoring within-school segregation and for increasing staff development efforts in schools that deviate from standards set for racial/ethnic composition of classrooms. However, the documentation did not cite the implementation of specific activities generated by OEEO to provide in-service for counselors involved in the student selection/placement process.

Numerous staff development activities implemented by the Department of Pupil Personnel Services and Special Education Program Development and the Bureau of Staff Development focused on nondiscriminatory assessment. The documentation also mentioned a number of activities focused on nondiscriminatory student selection and placement procedures. According to the reports reviewed, in-service workshops on nondiscriminatory student selection and placement were attended by principals, high school programmers, district superintendents, and administrative assistants. Note that the reports did not specifically cite participation of counselors in these in-service activities. However, in the 1983-84 school year, school guidance counselors, high school programmers, and all eighth grade teachers were participants in a city-wide half-day staff development session on maximizing student participation in vocational education training.

This recommendation requires on-going and continuous implementation of staff development activities which center on reduction of within-school segregation. Perhaps a goal of the recently funded Trainers Institute -- namely, to conduct training programs to facilitate and manage change processes related to desegregation and equity issues -- may affect implementation of this recommendation.

11. Student Discipline -- In-service for Administrators, Faculty, and Students

---

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

IMPLEMENT IN-SERVICE EDUCATION PROGRAMS AS SOON AS POSSIBLE FOR THOSE INVOLVED IN THE DISCIPLINARY PROCESS: ADMINISTRATORS, FACULTY, AND STUDENTS.

Staff development sessions on the Uniform Discipline Code were implemented in 1981, 1982, and 1983. According to the documentation, these sessions were attended by various staff involved in the disciplinary process, including elementary and high school principals, counselors, social workers, truant officers, school nurses, and counseling coordinators. In addition, elementary and high school guidance counselors participated in a city-wide half-day staff development activity on the Uniform Discipline Code. The documentation provided ample evidence of the implementation of this recommendation.

Staff assigned to the Uniform Discipline Code project conducted feedback in-service sessions for 100 parents, 200 teachers, and guidance counselors city-wide during the 1983-84 school year. Further on-going in-service efforts have been made by staff in the Bureau of Pupil Personnel Service and in the OEEO for administrators, faculty, and students.

The Code is being translated into Spanish, Polish, Arabic, and Chinese and plans for translation into five more

languages by November, 1984, have been made. More staff development activities are planned for the 1984-85 school year.

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

FOCUS IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS ON HUMAN RELATIONS AND MULTIETHNIC AND MULTI-CULTURAL RELATIONS, AND ON METHODS AND TECHNIQUES FOR REDUCING DISCIPLINE PROBLEMS, REDUCING SUSPENSIONS, AND DEVELOPING STRATEGIES TO IMPROVE THE LEARNING CLIMATE IN THE CLASSROOM.

During the period from 1981 to 1983 the Bureau of Staff Development offered several Lane III promotional credit courses and mini-courses related to this recommendation.

OEEO (Bureau of Support Services) presented two major workshops devoted to discipline. The workshops provided discussion sessions focused on models for equitable discipline, conflict resolution, within-school suspension, classroom management, and reality therapy, among other topics. Another major workshop was presented by the Bureau of Support Services on multi-cultural reinforcement. The content of this workshop included discussions on multi-cultural curriculum, the societal curriculum, cultural values, and American Indian educational issues. The Bureau of Support Services' workshops on effective schools included sessions on effective school climate, school discipline, the Uniform Discipline Code and discipline management, and multicultural and multilingual concepts. The workshops were planned mainly for the 104 schools selected by OEEO for staff development support and were attended by

administrative staff, teacher representatives, counselors, other support staff, and parents.

During the 1983-84 school year, OEEO conducted workshops on the topics listed in this recommendation. There undoubtedly will be an on-going need for staff development in this area, but OEEO's efforts to date have been consistent with the intent of this recommendation.

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

DISTRIBUTE TO ALL STUDENTS, PARENTS, AND FACULTY THE NEW UNIFORM CODE OF STUDENT CONDUCT, AND SCHEDULE APPROPRIATE ORIENTATION SESSIONS FOR ALL STUDENTS AND FACULTY TO REVIEW AND DISCUSS THE CONTENTS OF THE CODE.

OEEO has documentation to substantiate the distribution of the Uniform Discipline Code to each school in the system. In addition, copies were included in the packets of materials handed out to principals, teachers, and support staff in attendance at the two OEEO-sponsored workshops devoted to discipline. The documentation cited the implementation of orientation sessions on the Code for principals, teachers, and support staff. A city-wide half-day staff development workshop on the Uniform Discipline Code was conducted for elementary and high school guidance counselors.

While the evidence does not indicate that all teachers in the Chicago Public Schools received copies of the Uniform Discipline Code, it is clear that a copy of the Code is available in each school for use by teachers and support

staff. There has been a concerted effort to acquaint every teacher in the Chicago Public Schools with the Uniform Discipline Code.

Beginning in September, 1982, the revised version of the Coce has been distributed to students, parents, and faculty. Parents (on report card pick-up days) and students have received the Code handbook. Refer to the earlier recommendation on in-service education programs for additional information concerning discussion of the Code contents.

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAINING FOR COUNSELORS IN THE AREA OF DROPOUT PREVENTION.

There was no evidence of implementation of this recommendation in the documents reviewed up to 1984. Subsequent implementation -- of any kind -- remains obscure.

For example, an entry under the heading of staff development discusses the reporting procedures to be followed by "various departmental staff" in collecting data on dropouts. Interdepartmental (which apparently means Vocational Education and the Bureau of In-service Training) in-service training of high school teachers on perceptions of disadvantaged youth and on the role of high school staff instructors as "quasi counselors" is listed as a 1984-85 priority (ADR, September, 1984).

In the report on the school discipline component, reference was made to a task force and to three committees which are working on dropout prevention recommendations and plans for action, including staff development, in 1984-85. In sum, there continues to be no documentation on implementation of in-service training for counselors.

12. Staff Development

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

UNDERTAKE A STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM IN MAY, 1981 FOR VARIOUS CATEGORIES OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL: CONDUCT A STAFF ORIENTATION PROGRAM FOR ALL DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENTS, BUILDING PRINCIPALS, AND SELECTED PERSONNEL FROM CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION TO PROVIDE INFORMATION ON THE DESEGREGATION PLAN.

Desegregation orientation sessions were conducted for the district superintendents on June 24, 1981, and for Executive Staff on June 29, 1981. On-going orientation regarding desegregation implementation was provided at the district superintendents' weekly meetings with the Executive Staff. In the two-day Administrative Academy for elementary and high school principals held on August 31 and September 1, 1981, several desegregation-related topics were discussed. In addition, OEEO staff met with district superintendents, central office supervisors, principals, and

counselors to explain desegregation plan requirements and programmatic obligations of the educational components.

Furthermore, in June 1984, a three-day planning conference entitled "Working Together to Affect Effective Schools" -- which focused on leadership, instructional strategies, and student achievement -- was held.* It provided opportunities for the principal, one teacher facilitator, and one instructional aide from 107 schools in the Chicago Effective Schools Project to meet, share ideas, and work together to acquire insights on effective schools practices. (A follow-up conference was scheduled for August, 1984.) The conference -- organized by the OEEO in cooperation with the Bureau of Staff Development, Program Planning, and Monitoring Services and the Trainers Institute -- was an example of the kind of joint undertaking that is needed to implement the Staff Development components of the Student Desegregation Plan.

Desegregation Plan Recommendations

UNDERTAKE A STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM IN MAY, 1981 FOR VARIOUS CATEGORIES OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL: CONDUCT A SIMILAR ORIENTATION PROGRAM FOR ALL COUNSELORS AND ADJUSTMENT TEACHERS.

It was reported that OEEO met with Board personnel (including counselors) during the 1981-82 school year to

*"The Chicago Effective Schools Project Conference: Working Together to Affect Effective Schools" (Chicago: Chicago Public Schools, Office of Equal Educational Opportunity, June 13-15, 1984)

explain desegregation plan requirements and programmatic obligations of the educational components. However, the documentation reviewed did not specifically mention the implementation in May, 1981, of an orientation program on the desegregation plan for counselors and adjustment teachers.

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

UNDERTAKE A STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
IN MAY, 1981 FOR VARIOUS CATEGORIES
OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL:
PROVIDE INFORMATION FOR ALL TEACHERS
BY SHOWING EDITED VIDEOTAPES OF THE ABOVE SESSIONS.

There was no mention in the documentation of the preparation of videotapes of orientation sessions on the Student Desegregation Plan. There was also no mention of the use of videotapes to provide all teachers with information about the Plan. The documentation mentioned the airing of one half-day presentation on the re-direction of the instructional program on WTTW. It is not clear whether this presentation was related to the desegregation effort.

Based on the major effort to implement the peer tutoring model, it could be assumed that the district superintendents disseminated information about the Student Desegregation Plan to principals who, in turn, transmitted the information to their teachers and support staffs. There was no evidence in the documentation to indicate that this

process was monitored to assure that all school personnel received information about the Plan.

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

PLAN AND IMPLEMENT A STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR SEPTEMBER OF 1981: CONDUCT AN IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM FOR PRINCIPALS IN SCHOOLS AFFECTED BY PUPIL REASSIGNMENT.

The documentation cited the implementation of a workshop entitled "Planning for Change in Newly Desegregated Schools" on September 18, 1981, for 50 administrators. Since this information was derived from secondary data, it was difficult to ascertain if these administrators were drawn exclusively from newly desegregated schools.

In December, 1981, 877 teachers, administrators, and other school personnel from newly desegregated schools attended a five-hour training program conducted by the Race/Desegregation Institute and sponsored by Northeastern Illinois University. The specific number of principals in attendance was not cited in the report.

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

PLAN AND IMPLEMENT A STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR SEPTEMBER OF 1981: CONDUCT IN-SERVICE TRAINING FOR COUNSELORS, ADJUSTMENT TEACHERS, SOCIAL WORKERS, AND OTHER ANCILLARY STAFF

On October 13, 1981, 50 high school counselors attended an orientation meeting regarding magnet schools, other voluntary programs, and pupil assignment activities related to the Student Desegregation Plan. As mentioned earlier, 877 teachers, administrators, and "other school personnel" from newly desegregated schools attended a five-hour training session conducted by the Race/Desegregation Institute in December, 1981. The documentation did not define "other school personnel," nor did it provide a breakdown of how many of the 877 participants were counselors, adjustment teachers, social workers, and other ancillary staff. The Annual Desegregation Review, 1982-83 made reference to meetings held with counselors in 1981-82 to explain desegregation plan requirements and programmatic obligations of the educational components.

While there was no evidence of implementation of a staff development program in September, 1981, for counselors, adjustment teachers, social workers, and other ancillary staff, staff development activities were implemented in October and December, 1981, for many representatives from each of these groups.

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

PLAN AND IMPLEMENT A STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR SEPTEMBER OF 1981: CONDUCT IN-SERVICE TRAINING FOR ALL TEACHERS IN SCHOOLS AFFECTED BY PUPIL REASSIGNMENT.

The December 1, 1981, workshop sponsored by the Race/Desegregation Institute was the only specific citation in the documentation which referred to the implementation of in-service training on a date close to September, 1981, for teachers affected by pupil reassignment. It is impossible to determine from the citation how many of the 877 participants were teachers and whether the number of teacher participants included all of the teachers in schools affected by reassignment. The Annual Desegregation Review, 1982-83 cited the participation of staff from 33 desegregated schools in a series of seven major workshops on desegregation implemented during the period from December 10, 1981 to June 22, 1982. Upon verification, it was discovered that these workshops were actually conducted during the period from December 10, 1982 to June 22, 1983.

Assessment of the status of activities which occurred during 1981 was complicated by the lack of documentation for these activities in OEEO's Bureau of Support Services (the Bureau did not exist at that time). Also, it would appear that many records were still packed as a result of the change in the Board's facilities from downtown to Pershing Road.

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

REQUIRE THAT ALL ADMINISTRATORS WITH RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTING ANY ASPECT OF THE OVERALL DESEGREGATION PLAN COMPLETE RELEVANT PRE-SERVICE TRAINING.

In their description of the pre-service training the Consultant's Research report noted that:

> The proposed program of pre-service training for administrators is designed to be completed in sequential phases, with Board certification upon completion of the program. The provision for certification will serve both to ensure the attendance of administrators and to enhance the seriousness that they bring to the sessions.

It was reported that Board Report #82-212-9 (October 28, 1981) directed local, district, and central office administrators to complete 30 hours of in-service training designed to improve understanding of desegregation generally, and Chicago's Plan specifically. There was no evidence in the documentation reviewed of any directives regarding the completion of pre-service training by appropriate administrators. The rationale for this recommendation, along with the use of the word "require," implied a need to establish policy regarding pre-service training for administrators and procedures for certifying the completion of the prescribed training program.

The documentation indicated that orientation sessions were held for district superintendents and Executive Staff on June 24, 1981, and June 29, 1981, respectively, and that on-going orientation was provided at district superin-

tendents' weekly meetings with the Executive Staff. A one-week workshop was held August 24-28, 1981, for 45 principals of Target Schools for purposes of assisting them to complete needs assessments and program plans. It was reported that a follow-up series of workshops was planned for Target School principals, but the documentation reviewed did not provide evidence that the planned follow-up workshops were implemented. It was further reported that a two-day Administrative Academy was held August 31 and September 1, 1981, to convey information in a variety of areas, including several desegregation-related topics.

A number of staff development activities were apparently implemented which were compatible with the sequence suggested in the Consultants' Research Report; however, one element that appears to be missing here is the implementation of a certification process to assure the desired level of participation.

During the 1983-84 school year, six workshops for 168 newly certified principals were conducted by the Bureau of Staff Development, Program Planning, and Monitoring Services. Some of the topics concerned the Desegregation Plan. Obviously, as reported (ADR, September, 1984), the certification criterion remained unmet.

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

INCORPORATE, AS PART OF THE PRE-SERVICE AND ON-GOING IN-SERVICE TRAINING, STAFF DEVELOPMENT NEEDS IDENTIFIED AS NECESSARY TO OTHER PLAN COMPONENTS, WITH PARTICULAR ATTENTION TO UNIFORM DISCIPLINE CODES; "EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS" INTERVENTION IN TARGET SCHOOLS; PUBLIC LAW 94-142 REQUIREMENTS FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION; IMPLEMENTATION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE PROCEDURES

A long list of on-going staff development activities focused on components of the Student Desegregation Plan. According to the documentation, these activities covered a wide range of topics related to this recommendation. The third phase of the staff development program (on-going in-service training) proposed in the Consultants' Research Report addresses this recommendation. It was described as follows:

> The in-service training phase, or phase three, would be conducted on the basis of formal and informal needs assessments related to the planned desegregation intervention. It is suggested that three steering committees be established in each district to (a) coordinate the needs assessment process, (b) identify staff resources necessary to meet the needs assessment, and (c) evaluate the impact of in-service programs on students and staff. During the in-service phase, every attempt will be made to identify topics which will assist personnel in a desegregated setting.
>
> A formative and summative evaluation of the staff development effort is suggested. Continuous evaluation will be required if the staff development activities are expected to have the desired impact... (p.535)

OEEO conducted an assessment of the needs of the 104 schools selected by OEEO for staff development support in

1982-83. The workshops conducted by OEEO during 1982-83 and 1983-84 were consistent with the needs highlighted in that assessment. The following list of topics, drawn from workshop agenda, represent the workshop topics which were derived from :he needs assessments and which also attend to the topics in this recommendation (see Charts 1 and 2).

Appendix Chart I

TOPICS OF OEEO WORKSHOPS, 1982-83

1. Management and Supervision of an Effective School
2. Effective School Climate and Organization
3. School Discipline and Management and Principal's Leadership Roles
4. Expectations for Learning and Reinforcing Achievement
5. Time on Task and the Use of Assessment Data
6. Effective Instruction and Student Team Learning
7. Role of Parents and Counselors
8. Equitable Discipline for Chicago Schools
9. Classroom Management - Reality Therapy
10. Conflict Resolution
11. Counseling and Teaching Students form Diverse Cultural Backgrounds
12. Stress Management for Personal and Professional
13. Philosophy and Implementation of Peer Culture Development
14. Stress Management: High School and Upper Grades
15. Stress: Effects upon the Teacher as a Professional and as a Person
16. Teaching and Learning - Children, Teachers and Parents
17. Parental Input in Children's Academic Excellence
18. Parent-Teacher Contacts and Student Learning
19. Effective Schools: Parental Support
20. Parents Helping Schools
21. The Role of the Office of International Multicultural Education
22. What are the Differences That Differences Make in Urban Education
23. Responding Creatively to Differences in the Official, Hidden and Societal Curriculum
24. How Cultural Values Affect the Classroom

Appendix Chart I (continued)

TOPICS OF OEEO WORKSHOPS, 1982-83

25. American Indian Educational Issues and the Schools
26. We Are More Same Than Different
27. Multicultural Curriculum
28. Discipline in the High Schools
29. Classroom Management and Conflict Resolution
30. Solutions to Within-School Discipline
31. Discipline Practices in Sangamon County, Illinois
32. Assertive Discipline
33. Rx for Within-School Suspension Rooms
34. Chicago Public Schools' Discipline Code
35. Classroom Management Workshop
36. Equity Issues: Desegregation Mandate
37. Productive Relationship: Parent-School-Teacher
38. Parent-As-Partners
39. Use of Parent-Community Volunteers as a Teaching Strategy
40. Community: School to Home
41. Planning for Schools and Classroom Discipline Improvement
42. Planning for Classroom Management and School Desegregation
43. Philosophy and Underpinnings of Successful Chicago Schools Desegregation
44. Brief Description of Five Chicago Programs That Work
45. Cross-Cultural Communication

Appendix Chart II

MAJOR OEEO SPONSORED STAFF DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOPS

1983

January 26, 27; February 2 and 3	Program Goals, Objectives, and Evaluation Workshops
February 26	Equitable Discipline for Chicago Schools: Conflict Resolution, Classroom Management
March 30	Stress Management
April 20	Effective Schools: Teacher and Parent Involvement
May 24	Education in a Global Society: Multicultural Reinforcement
June 22	Equitable Discipline for Chicago Schools: Conflict Resolution, Classroom Management
July 25-29	Local Schools Planning Conference II: Equity for Chicago

1984

January 12	Developing Effective Schools for Chicago
January 19	Effective Schools and Parent Involvement
February 16	Equal Educational Opportunity: A Focus on Reform

Appendix Chart II (continued)

MAJOR OEEO SPONSORED STAFF DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOPS

March 14	Effective Instruction: Teaching Strategies, Learning Styles and Positive Outcomes
April 11	Student Leadership: A Strategy for Developing Effective Schools
May 17	Brown, 30 Years Later: Implications for Chicago
June 5	Effective School Climate in a Multicultural Society

In addition to the OEEO needs assessment process, the Bureau of Staff Development and the Bureau of Special Education Staff Development implemented other processes for formally and informally assessing needs. Needs assessment data probably are also collected by other programs within OEEO (e.g., Effective Schools, Options for Knowledge) and by other programs within the system that are supported by outside funding (e.g., Chapter I, State Title I).

According to the Director of the Bureau of Staff Development, the last systemwide needs assessment related to staff development was conducted four years ago. This assessment was based on a sample of 3,000 teachers. Due to a lack of staff and funds, since that time more informal methods have been initiated to compile needs assessment data.

OEEO has devoted considerable staff development time to needs assessment procedures, program development, and program monitoring strategies. A process, established in 1982-83 and extended in 1983-84, required local schools to use needs assessment data as the basis for program proposals in support of the desegregation effort. OEEO staff has monitored the degree of consistency between needs assessment results and proposed programs.

Evaluation data for the major workshops and miniworkshops conducted by OEEO's Bureau of Support Services were collected through participant feedback sheets. Response to OEEO workshops has been positive, but OEEO, like each department, bureau, and program offering staff development

activities, has its own "evaluation" format. For the most part, however, the "evaluation" takes the form of feedback sheets which assess participants' reactions to the workshop presentations and presenters.

The documentation reviewed contained no evidence of a mechanism to evaluate the impact of staff development. Apparently no baseline data were collected to assess the effectiveness of either desegregation/staff development or any other staff development efforts. Therefore, while apparently significant and worthwhile staff development activities may have taken place, it has not been possible to evaluate the degree to which staff development efforts have contributed to the success or failure of the Student Desegregation Plan. For further discussion, refer to item F in the Monitoring Commission Evaluation Report in this document.

13. Faculty Desegregation and Affirmative Action

Desegregation Plan Recommendation

ESTABLISH A COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM
FOR IDENTIFICATION, TRAINING, AND PLACEMENT OF
MINORITY CANDIDATES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS;
PRIORITY IN THIS EFFORT WILL BE DIRECTED
TOWARD MEMBERS OF MINORITY GROUPS SIGNIFICANTLY
UNDERREPRESENTED IN ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS.

The report on the status of implementation of Faculty Desegregation and Affirmative Action recommendations will address this recommendation.

Bibliography

Annual Desgregation Review: 1982-83. Chicago: Board of Education, August, 1982.

"An Overview of Staff Development Programs in Support of the Student Desegregation Plan for the Chicago Public Schools." Chicago: Board of Education, Department of Instruction Services, 1983.

Brownlee, Geraldine D. "Interim Report of the Subcommittee on Affirmative Action and Staff Development." Chicago: Board of Education, Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation, November, 1982.

Burke, Peter J., Christensen, Judith C., and Fessler, Ralph. Tender Career Stages: and Implications for Staff Development. #ISBN 0-87367-214-3. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1984.

Green, Robert L. Consultants' Research Report. Chicago: Board of Education, January, 1982.

Green, Robert L. Student Desegregation Plan for the Chicago Public Schools, Part I: Educational Components. Chicago: Board of Education, April 15, 1981.

Green, Robert L. Student Desegregation Plan for the Chicago Public Schools: Recommendations on Educational Components. Chicago: Board of Education, 1981.

Green, Robert L. Final Consultants' Research Report PT1: Educational Components. January, 1982.

Griffin, Gary A. (ED). Staff Development. Eighty-Second Year Book of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Joyce, Bruce R. and Showers, Beverly. Power in Staff Development Through Research on Training. ASCD #611-83304. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1983.

Moore, Richard W. Master Teachers. ISBN 0-87367-201-1. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1984.

Preliminary Annual Review on Aspects of Student Desegregation Implementation of the Student Desegregation Plan. Chicago: Board of Education, May, 1982.

Progress Report on Implementation of the Student Desegregation Plan. Chicago: Board of Education, August, 1981.

Progress Report on Implementation of the Student Desegregation Plan. Chicago: Board of Education, November, 1981.

Progress Report on Implementation of the Student Desegregation Plan. Chicago: Board of Education, May, 1982.

Tanner, Daniel and Tanner, Laurel. Curriculum Development: Theory Into Practice. New York: McMillan Publishing Co. 1980.